

The Sun.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1915.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
DAILY, Per Month, \$3.00
DAILY, Per Year, \$36.00
SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.00
SUNDAY, Per Year, \$12.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$4.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$48.00

FOREIGN RATES.
DAILY, Per Month, \$5.00
DAILY, Per Year, \$60.00
SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.50
SUNDAY, Per Year, \$18.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$6.50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$78.00

THE EVENING SUN, Per Month, \$1.00
THE EVENING SUN, Per Year, \$12.00
THE EVENING SUN (Foreign), Per Mo. \$1.50

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 120 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer, William C. Reck, 120 Nassau street; Vice-President, Edward P. Mitchell, 120 Nassau street; Secretary, C. E. Linton, 120 Nassau street.

London office, 11 Abchurch Lane, 1 Abchurch Lane, Strand, London, W.C. 2, England. Paris office, 10, Rue de la Michodiere, 10, Rue de la Michodiere, Paris, France. Washington office, 1110 Building, 1110 Building, Washington, D.C. Brooklyn office, 120 Livingston street, 120 Livingston street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The People of New York Have Already a Safeguard Against Military Despotism.

We yield neither to Judge Cullen nor to our neighbor the World in the earnestness of our belief that the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of this State ought to contain a clause specifically protecting citizens not engaged in military or naval service from the attempts of military tribunals to exercise jurisdiction while the regularly constituted State courts are open to administer justice.

The subordination of martial to civil law under these circumstances is in the very essence of republican government.

Judge Cullen makes a perfect case for the incorporation in our Constitution of this additional safeguard of civil liberty. It is not in the present Constitution. It is not proposed in the Constitution soon to go before the people. It must be put there by a subsequent process of amendment; and Judge Cullen seems to regard as a necessary preliminary to such amendment the rejection of the entire Constitution now proposed.

We cannot quite follow the reasoning of the eminent and respected jurist in this particular. It would appear to us very much like the Chinese method of roasting pig, as reported by CHARLES LAMB; that is, the method of burning the house down in order to cook the meat.

Our neighbor the World, which strenuously opposed the new Constitution on other grounds before Judge Cullen issued his address to the voters, ably seizes upon this additional reason for discrediting it and calling for its defeat. Our neighbor points out that New York is the only one of the forty-eight States whose Constitution does not declare that the military shall be forever subordinate to the civil power.

Well might any person who reads our esteemed contemporary's stirring remarks in support of Judge Cullen's proposition suppose that the ten million people of the Empire State stand now, and will continue to stand (unless the new Constitution is rejected in its entirety by the voters a month hence, unprotected by any provision of organic law against the most outrageous usurpations and oppressions of military tyranny.

If the new Constitution is defeated because it omits to provide a certain desirable addition to the Bill of Rights the next convention to revise the instrument in its totality cannot be held until after an interval of twenty years; that is, unless there shall be special legislative provision for an earlier revision.

But if the new Constitution is adopted next month notwithstanding its failure to include this desirable provision, the desirable provision can be made an integral part of the Constitution by the ordinary process of amendment in detail; a process requiring two years and perhaps a campaign of education in which we are confident that the World would powerfully add its efforts to those of Judge Cullen and THE SUN.

What, then, in the view of those whose only objection to the new Constitution is the omission pointed out by Judge Cullen, is to be gained by defeating it on that account in November?

If the World is anxious about the safety of civil law and civilian rights against martial aggression during the comparatively brief period before the specific amendment can be made, we beg leave to remind it of the fact that our ten millions of fellow citizens are not even now wholly at the mercy of the mailed hand.

This may be the only State of the forty-eight whose Constitution does not declare that the military shall be

forever subordinate to the civil power, but nevertheless New York enjoys equally with the forty-seven other States the comprehensive and adequate protection against military domination which is afforded by the fourth section of Article IV. of the Constitution of the United States. The fourth section guarantees "to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

Certainly this ought to afford a reasonable measure of safety to our civilian population and of reassurance to our esteemed neighbor the World during the two years or so which would be required for the process of putting the supremacy of civil law into New York's Bill of Rights.

Register!

Registration for the election on November 2 began yesterday under a new system which allows six opportunities instead of four for qualified citizens to put their names on the poll list. Every day this week from 5:30 o'clock in the afternoon until 10 o'clock in the evening the booths will be open, and on Saturday the officers will be at their posts from 7 o'clock in the morning.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of the subjects to be voted on next month. The revised Constitution, with its scheme of efficiency and economy, will be accepted or rejected; the appeal of women for the ballot will be answered; and the \$27,000,000 bond issue for the canals will be approved or beaten. Yet the apathy that marked the primaries threatens to keep the registration down and leave to a small fraction of the State's population the settlement of these serious questions.

One result of the new registration practice will be to make practically valueless comparisons between this year's figures and those of former years. In the past we have had four days to prepare the rolls; now we have five evenings and one day, and political estimators will be deprived of one of their most frequently cited bases for predictions.

Danger in the New Cancer Cure.

The new treatment of cancer reported in THE SUN presents a hopeful aspect with regard to inoperable cases. The caution displayed by Dr. Bern in his article in the New York Medical Journal against false deductions attests the scientific spirit of the author.

The results so far obtained are as promising as the radium treatment was in its earlier manifestations. When the use of radium was being hailed with joy THE SUN urged its readers not to be misled into neglect of any growth but to submit the case to surgical diagnosis and if the growth was pronounced malignant, to lose no previous time in experimentation with any remedy, but to follow the surgeon's advice of immediate removal.

Dr. Bern strikes before the enemy mobilizes his malign forces, when he advises that before the operation the patient should receive a few injections, and that immediately after the operation the treatment should be resumed. It is to be regretted that he did not lay special emphasis upon the danger of delaying the operation if favorable local effects from the injections appeared. If he had the surgical instinct, he would insist that danger of all cancer remedies lurks in the probable neglect of the only known protection against recurrence; that is, immediate operation on all suspected growths. The sufferer, dreading surgical procedures, will be lulled into a sense of false security by the possible shrinking of the growth under this injection and thus lose the protection against recurrence which menaces the neighboring glands which are not subjected to injection unless so large as to be visible, when it is too late. The surgeon alone is competent to search out these foci of certain infection and remove them. Cancer is a surgical disease from the beginning so far as its treatment is concerned.

Slight Breach of Neutrality.

Strict neutrality governs the conduct of New York in the dispute between Mr. MORAN's eminent young men from Philadelphia and Mr. CARMEGAN's cultured representatives of Boston. The championship of the world has no personal appeal to this town, with Mr. McGRAW's minions anchored to the cedar bottom and Mr. DOUGLAS's wild men thoroughly tamed. Yet it may be permitted without breach of etiquette to admire the modesty of GROVER CLEVELAND ALEXANDER, the bright and lasting hope of the plier's box, who has endured praise enough to turn a dozen men's heads, but who retains his modesty and sense of proportion sufficiently to admit that:

"I am not the whole team and I never could win but for the support I receive from team mates."

A champion of champions, a master of speed and curves and cunning, the object of adulation no mere statesman can hope to have spent upon him; and he remembers that eight other men contribute to his glory!

We salute the mighty ALEXANDER. He has "the stuff."

Washington Market.

Old Washington Market, now reopening after reconstruction, has grown with the town it helps to feed. In 1812 it was planted between the Dixie farm and the lands of Trinity Church, and after the war with England it shone not less brilliantly than other contributors to the

city's blame of festal illumination. In 1834, and twice again before the civil war, the market was enlarged, spreading over more land along the river-side. In 1860 it was burned; those were the times when "society" drove out with the market basket in pursuit of the choicest cuts and freshest vegetables; when gentlemen of affairs or no affairs made it a meeting place, and when butchers deservedly prospered when came down to business in the glory of high hats, frock coats and glossy footgear.

The building now remodelled dates back to the days, not yet legendary but fast receding, of Mayor ENOS; it was completed in 1884. In 1910 Mr. MCANINNY cleared the sidewalks of obstructing stalls; in 1912 the market's centennial anniversary was fitly celebrated, and in the spring of 1914 began the work of rehabilitation which has made the market a model of commercial sanitation and convenience.

Washington Market has a past, and no one need think that the market men fail to value it sentimentally; but the spirit of friendly accommodation that marks its dispensers of fatness and good cheer is immortal in the generations.

The Gallipoli Campaign.

In his report of the Anglo-French operations in Gallipoli from May 5 to July 1, recently published by Lord KITCHENER in London, General SIR IAN HAMILTON says that the objective in three terrible days of fighting from May 7 to May 10 was Krithia. At a very heavy cost in casualties the British and French gained from 400 to 600 yards, but they did not reach and occupy Krithia, which is a mile southwest of the commanding hill of Achi Baba (700 feet) and only five miles from Sedd el Bahr, the tip of the Gallipoli Peninsula. The Turks in their strong intrenchments at Krithia and on the slopes of Achi Baba still defy the Allies. One hundred and fifty days of fighting, and Krithia still remains the objective in southern Gallipoli.

In Mr. ASHMEAD BARTLETT's narrative (September 2) of the desperate and futile attempt of the new expeditionary force landed in Suvla Bay to seize the Anafarta hills, he says that "the great strategic scheme" was to force the enemy "to abandon his positions before Achi Baba and on the Kilit Bahr salient." Kilit Bahr is on the Narrows, opposite Chanak on the Asiatic side, nine miles northeast of Achi Baba and twelve miles south-east of Suvla Bay. The diversion of Sir IAN HAMILTON signified that he could not gain through the Turkish line stretched on both sides of Achi Baba and four miles across the end of the peninsula from the Egean to the Dardanelles. What he could not do by frontal attack he sought to accomplish by a strategic victory fifteen miles to the north. If he could capture the enemy's positions on the Anafarta hills he would have the Turkish forces in the Achi Baba and Kilit Bahr sectors in a trap, because he would be able to cut off their supply trains.

As soon as the landing was made at Suvla Bay London was cocksure that the beginning of the end for the Turks in Gallipoli had come. Sir IAN HAMILTON's plan was evidently known, but confidence in the execution of it had only a visionary basis. Mr. ASHMEAD BARTLETT tells a thrilling story of gallantry by the Yeomanry, but Hill 112 was never taken and Hill 70 was occupied only to be abandoned under an enfilading fire by the Turks from a knoll higher up in the maze of elevations that characterizes the peninsula.

The British position in the north is much the same as the British position in the south; the Suvla Bay landing force has joined hands with the New Zealanders and other troops five miles south at Anzac Cove in the shadow of Sari Bahr (571 feet), but the invaders are on low ground and facing Turkish intrenchments on the hills. The Turks have had ample time to despatch reinforcements from their Bulair lines north of Suvla Bay, and there has been no interruption of their supply trains. At present there is evidently the same kind of deadlock in the Anafarta sector as before Achi Baba. The Allies can derive satisfaction from their success in gaining a foothold for intrenching on the Egean coast twelve miles north of the Narrows, but they seem impatient to carry any commanding positions in their front. And the season when offensive operations become impracticable is fast approaching.

"Quite American Outing."

Those Japanese who on Sunday had a "very nice American outing," as Dr. TOYOHITO TAKAMI, president of the Japanese Association, called it, need not think that their deceit, cleverly planned and efficiently executed though it was, will fool American patriots of the Hobson school.

The Japanese are as thorough as the Germans. They carried an American flag side by side with the banner of the Rising Sun; a shallow artifice. They neglected the sushi to be eaten with hashi, and feigned a fondness for ham sandwich and dill pickle; we wonder, considering the plots against our peace that the descendants of CASSANDRA tell us are hatching in Nipponese political incubators, that the picnic vultures did not stick in the throats of the Mikadoons. They played baseball; thinking the while, no doubt, how the armies of Nippon would (after crossing the ocean, cleared of Uncle SAM's navy, in a hundred thousand transports) steal second at Chicago and slide home at New York. No detail was omitted; they ran a three-legged race; in one breath they shouted "Kill the empire," in the next

they gave three bannals for "Honorable President Woodrow Wilson." After "Kimigayo" they sang "The Star Spangled Banner," thus outdoing the native born. This was perhaps the worst point in their astutely composed programme of deception. Its crowning glory, or horror, was the diabolically ingenious ceremony called Burying the Hyphen.

Mr. SEMMOSHI of the Japanese Times laughed at the "nuts" who "come in to tell us Japan will fight United States." Consul-General T. NAKAMURA thought the "dream invasion" very funny. There is nothing funny about it. Everybody that has ears to hear knows that Japan, developing industrially, needs the product of our mills and foundries, and the cheapest way to get them is to fight for them. Besides, Japan is ready to burst with expanding population, and her only anxiety must be whether the United States, decrepit, empty of spirit as Hobsonites speaking with much confidence tell us she is, would put up a stiff enough resistance to give the island empire the desired relief through blood letting.

We know these wily Orientals!

British munitions makers to aid American strikers. New York Herald.

In the interest of neutrality?

President PERRY of the Board of Tax Commissioners does not want to discuss at present the ingenious system for increasing the city's revenues his colleagues have adopted; and as Mr. PERRY's opinions on the tax problem are fairly well known it is not really necessary for him to characterize this specific exhibition of folly.

It may be that the tax assessors thought they would catch all who believe they are going to win millions speculating in war stocks.

Judge BEN BARR LINDSEY's threat to take the warpath with a shotgun and wade through blood to vindication has shocked the East, which knows him only as a former of wild men and had him an amiable, rotund little person brimful of the milk of human kindness. But the old Adam will out—BEN was born in Tennessee.

This morning thousands of persons drove to the city of Berlin, Germany, to see the Kaiser in the Koenigsplatz—Berlin cable.

To be included, we presume, among the "great German drives."

With what great satisfaction those who lament the frivolity of American college "men" will receive the news that even in the height of the football season the students of the University of Pennsylvania have time to think of the sacred right of silly talk!

THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

Former Lieutenant-Governor Sheehan on the Apportionment Articles.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Mr. Wickham will not gain votes for the new Constitution by attempting to justify the outrageous apportionment article adopted by the recent Constitutional Convention, nor will intelligent men be impressed with his statement that the article as presented is "a conservative measure" between the extremes of partisanship.

Again, Mr. Wickham is not fortunate in saying "The Constitutional Convention of 1894 felt compelled to divide the State into Senate and Assembly districts and apportion the inhabitants thereof to and among such districts because of the fact that only two years before that convention an apportionment was made by the Democratic Legislature which is now admitted, even by representatives of the Democratic party, to have been grossly unfair." It is sufficient to say of the Democratic legislative apportionment of 1892 that it was upheld by the Court of Appeals of this State. Under that apportionment the Democratic party had a majority of 23 on joint ballot, the State having voted for Mr. Cleveland by 45,000 majority. The next year the apportionment of 1892 was quick to respond to the popular vote, for the Republican party had a majority of 19 on joint ballot, although that party's candidates for State officers received but 24,000 majority.

When this article was under discussion I reminded the convention that in the thirty years of my political activities, from 1885 to 1915, Democratic Governors had served the State for four years and Republican Governors for sixteen years, whereas during that same period the Democratic party was in joint control of the Senate and Assembly for only four years.

What a commentary upon the fairness of Republican apportionment is here presented, and how attractive this thought must be to the Democratic voters of the State! Until Mr. Wickham can point to an apportionment made by a Republican Legislature or by a Republican Constitutional Convention that responded fairly to expressed public opinion, the less he says about the only apportionment that did so respond the better.

The new apportionment article is more indefensible than the one of 1894. At that time the Republican delegates openly admitted that their purpose in framing the present article was political. The scheme was hatched in a caucus of Republican delegates. The convention simply registered it; it decided nothing. All was determined in secret behind closed doors, and the purpose and effect of their work was to prevent legislative control passing from Republican to Democratic hands. It was well said in the address to the people by the fifty-eight Democratic delegates to the convention of 1894: "The main aim of the Republican delegates was a partisan apportionment." The convention of 1894 declared that the territory now embraced within the counties of New York, Kings and Bronx should not have more than fifty per cent of the Senators, although that territory might have sixty or even seventy per cent of the population of the State. Some of the Republican delegates in the convention of 1894 attempted to justify their act by declaring that injury to this locality was far distant and that another convention would be held before that territory would have a population sufficiently large to become entitled to more than fifty per cent of the Senate.

As a matter of fact the territory now known as Greater New York had a population in 1910 of 4,764,883, equal to 52 per cent of the total population of the State. On this basis the city of New York would now be entitled to twenty-six Senators instead of its present representation of twenty-one. That the population will continue to increase during the next twenty years is certain, and equally certain is it that the city will become entitled to increased legislative representation before another convention is held.

Mr. Wickham meets this situation as it was met twenty years ago, by saying "the effect of this prohibition is still entirely academic." It may have been somewhat academic twenty years ago, but the taxpayers of the city of New York have been made to realize that it is an actual living reality now. It is small comfort to a man whose home is being sold under foreclosure to assure him that the situation confronting him is "entirely academic."

Mr. Wickham says that the apportionment of 1894 was ratified by majority of the voters in the State and city. This is true; but, as I pointed out to the convention, Democracy in 1894 was not a name to conjure with. The passage of the Wilson tariff law in 1893 was followed by a long period of commercial and industrial depression; the streets were filled with idle men; the public was being daily fed on the alleged maladministration of the city of New York under Democratic rule; the scandals of the Police Department aroused the city and the State to a high pitch of indignation. The electoral law was prepared in the fall of 1894 to approve anything and everything that spelled opposition to Democracy. The Republican party triumphed not only in the State but in the Democratic city of New York. The tail went with the hide, and the outrageous apportionment was approved; not because it was right and fair but because it was believed that its approval represented an attack upon Democracy. Notwithstanding all this, the apportionment carried by only 53,000 majority, while the Republican candidate for Governor had a majority of 156,000.

Do not be misled into the belief that the apportionment article of the new Constitution is an improvement on the old one. So far as the city of New York is concerned it gets the exact punishment inflicted twenty years ago. That a handful of Republican delegates wanted to limit still further the representation of the greater city furnishes no excuse for claiming that because a greater wrong was weakly attempted we should forget the injustice and outrage of the old. The pages of history are filled with examples of tyrants and oppressors threatening greater hardships in order to make their slaves accept their chains as ornaments.

Under the old as well as under the

THE GREAT LOAN.

A Correspondent Who is Bothered Over It Asks Some Questions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: One thing concerning this proposed Anglo-French loan bothers me. That is its eventual industrial effect on this country. The loan will be payable in gold, and of course England and France will have less gold after the war than they have now. To get gold they will have to sell goods.

Naturally they will look to this country for their market and naturally their wares would be manufactured goods. Every import sold which is not manufactured will be so much returned gold, and of course England and France will have less gold after the war than they have now. To get gold they will have to sell goods.

1. Where are England and France to get the gold to pay the loan?
2. Will it not be paid in gold, and if so, how will they get it?
3. Can this market stand it?
4. If a high tariff be put on these goods, still, if any are sold, won't the demand for the product of the domestic manufacturer and artisan be curtailed by the fact that the goods will be sold at a higher price than they now are?

5. Is it natural to suppose that holders of our securities in England and France will be any more willing to part with their American stocks and bonds than they now are?
6. After the war won't these countries be obliged to keep on buying things and sell more and more of their own "war books"?

CHARLES N. HILLBURN.
BROOKLYN, October 4.

Nobody knows enough to supply the answers to all the riddles which may be propounded about the economic future after the war. Reasonable replies to the foregoing queries may be made as follows:

1. Not more than a quarter of the billion dollars indemnity wrung from France by Germany in 1871 was paid in gold, and less than one-twentieth of it was paid in French gold. The balance of the indemnity was remitted through bills of exchange, and in less than two years and a half, Great Britain and France will have from a minimum of five years to a maximum of thirty years in which to pay the Anglo-French loan, and it is hardly possible that the gold required for the purpose. A great mass of debt is falling due all the time which is payable in gold, but very little gold is in payment. The probabilities are, as a matter of fact, that this country will have an excessive stock of gold after the war, and it is more likely to export it than to import it on balance.

2. Only partly in the sale of manufactured goods to us. Great Britain and France will again manufacture for the whole world and, more than that, they will resume gradually their former position as purveyors of valuable services and providers of recreation and pleasure for other countries. Also they will be able to begin a process of collecting a great amount of money owing to them from all over the world as soon as international commerce and the exchange of goods begin to work toward a return to normal conditions.

3. Not if this market has boomed the price of goods, materials and labor to inflated levels, which attract excessive foreign competition.

4. If we do not export goods and services we cannot export goods and services. Great Britain and France have always been two of our best foreign customers, but they could not buy here if we had not bought there.

Yes, especially if our security prices are up to figures which invite selling at a time when capital may command a highly profitable price in Europe for the constructive activities of peace.

6. They will be better able to balance their trade with exports to all countries. This question is practically the same as the first.

OUR DEBT TO FRANCE.

Mr. Guthrie's Statement That It Was \$772,000,000 Is Challenged.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: At a dinner given to the Anglo-French mission Mr. W. D. Guthrie, the toastmaster, stated that, according to "reliable historians," France expended in behalf of the United States in 1873, 1874, 1875 and 1876 the great sum of \$772,000,000.

This may be credited as truth by some, but others of us may want the figures on which Mr. Guthrie's statement is based. Taking only half an hour's superficial review of the subject I find, on the authority of Guizot, that "the first military aid to Washington was rendered by France was received by Washington September 3, 1870, when Count De Grasse brought a reinforcement of 10,000 men and 100 guns to the capital. In a few months Louis XVI had lent to the Colonies, or procured for them on his own security, sums exceeding 16,000,000 livres" (Chapter LVIII, Guizot's "History of France").

In Chapter III, Volume 3, of Irving's "Washington" is presented a letter from the French minister to the United States in 1779, in which the minister "quite hopeless of promised succor from France" in Chapter VIII, allusion is made to Washington's frequent appeals to Congress to send foreign financial aid in men and money, and to its action on December 28, 1779, in commissioning Colonel John Laurens to apply for such aid at the court of Versailles.

In Harper's "Encyclopedia of American History" Laurens is credited with having secured a subsidy of \$1,200,000 and a further sum of \$1,000,000 was granted. The amount of the latter is not mentioned. As military activities ceased at the evacuation of New York, in September, 1783, the French mission from Mr. Guthrie's statement that France furnished the Colonies with \$772,000,000 in three years, although impoverished by the war, but do not believe in destroying the house because some detail of it does not suit me when I can so easily supply the detail and the destruction of the house will not render the detail any more easy of accomplishment.

There are other recommendations of the Bill of Rights Committee that I believe should have been incorporated in the Constitution. I regret they were not. But my disappointment at their non-appearance does not influence me to vote to destroy so much excellent work as the Constitution shows.

There probably were delegates who reasoned as your article indicates, that the New York courts would never hold as the West Virginia courts had; but they were undoubtedly more influenced by the shortness of the time left for the discussion of the Bill of Rights amendments—it was within a few hours at the end of the real convention work—and the fact that no harm such as was suggested by the amendment had occurred within twenty-one years without the amendment and that it was safe to say that the Legislature, the people, or the courts, or all three, could look after it if emergency arose. Otherwise they were averse to unnecessarily changing the present Constitution.

CHARLES H. YOUNG.
New York, October 3.

THE GREAT LOAN.

A Correspondent Who is Bothered Over It Asks Some Questions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: One thing concerning this proposed Anglo-French loan bothers me. That is its eventual industrial effect on this country. The loan will be payable in gold, and of course England and France will have less gold after the war than they have now. To get gold they will have to sell goods.

Naturally they will look to this country for their market and naturally their wares would be manufactured goods. Every import sold which is not manufactured will be so much returned gold, and of course England and France will have less gold after the war than they have now. To get gold they will have to sell goods.

1. Where are England and France to get the gold to pay the loan?
2. Will it not be paid in gold, and if so, how will they get it?
3. Can this market stand it?
4. If a high tariff be put on these goods, still, if any are sold, won't the demand for the product of the domestic manufacturer and artisan be curtailed by the fact that the goods will be sold at a higher price than they now are?

5. Is it natural to suppose that holders of our securities in England and France will be any more willing to part with their American stocks and bonds than they now are?
6. After the war won't these countries be obliged to keep on buying things and sell more and more of their own "war books"?

CHARLES N. HILLBURN.
BROOKLYN, October 4.

Nobody knows enough to supply the answers to all the riddles which may be propounded about the economic future after the war. Reasonable replies to the foregoing queries may be made as follows:

1. Not more than a quarter of the billion dollars indemnity wrung from France by Germany in 1871 was paid in gold, and less than one-twentieth of it was paid in French gold. The balance of the indemnity was remitted through bills of exchange, and in less than two years and a half, Great Britain and France will have from a minimum of five years to a maximum of thirty years in which to pay the Anglo-French loan, and it is hardly possible that the gold required for the purpose. A great mass of debt is falling due all the time which is payable in gold, but very little gold is in payment. The probabilities are, as a matter of fact, that this country will have an excessive stock of gold after the war, and it is more likely to export it than to import it on balance.

2. Only partly in the sale of manufactured goods to us. Great Britain and France will again manufacture for the whole world and, more than that, they will resume gradually their former position as purveyors of valuable services and providers of recreation and pleasure for other countries. Also they will be able to begin a process of collecting a great amount of money owing to them from all over the world as soon as international commerce and the exchange of goods begin to work toward a return to normal conditions.

3. Not if this market has boomed the price of goods, materials and labor to inflated levels, which attract excessive foreign competition.

4. If we do not export goods and services we cannot export goods and services. Great Britain and France have always been two of our best foreign customers, but they could not buy here if we had not bought there.

Yes, especially if our security prices are up to figures which invite selling at a time when capital may command a highly profitable price in Europe for the constructive activities of peace.

6. They will be better able to balance their trade with exports to all countries. This question is practically the same as the first.

OUR DEBT TO FRANCE.

Mr. Guthrie's Statement That It Was \$772,000,000 Is Challenged.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: At a dinner given to the Anglo-French mission Mr. W. D. Guthrie, the toastmaster, stated that, according to "reliable historians," France expended in behalf of the United States in 1873, 1874, 1875 and 1876 the great sum of \$772,000,000.

This may be credited as truth by some, but others of us may want the figures on which Mr. Guthrie's statement is based. Taking only half an hour's superficial review of the subject I find, on the authority of Guizot, that "the first military aid to Washington was rendered by France was received by Washington September 3, 1870, when Count De Grasse brought a reinforcement of 10,000 men and 100 guns to the capital. In a few months Louis XVI had lent to the Colonies, or procured for them on his own security, sums exceeding 16,000,000 livres" (Chapter LVIII, Guizot's "History of France").

In Chapter III, Volume 3, of Irving's "Washington" is presented a letter from the French minister to the United States in 1779, in which the minister "quite hopeless of promised succor from France" in Chapter VIII, allusion is made to Washington's frequent appeals to Congress to send foreign financial aid in men and money, and to its action on December 28, 1779, in commissioning Colonel John Laurens to apply for such aid at the court of Versailles.

In Harper's "Encyclopedia of American History" Laurens is credited with having secured a subsidy of \$1,200,000 and a further sum of \$1,000,000 was granted. The amount of the latter is not mentioned. As military activities ceased at the evacuation of New York, in September, 1783, the French mission from Mr. Guthrie's statement that France furnished the Colonies with \$772,000,000 in three years, although impoverished by the war, but do not believe in destroying the house because some detail of it does not suit me when I can so easily supply the detail and the destruction of the house will not render the detail any more easy of accomplishment.

There are other recommendations of the Bill of Rights Committee that I believe should have been incorporated in the Constitution. I regret they were not. But my disappointment at their non-appearance does not influence me to vote to destroy so much excellent work as the Constitution shows.

There probably were delegates who reasoned as your article indicates, that the New York courts would never hold as the West